

Hennepin-University
Partnership



Report: Status of the Hennepin- University Partnership and Proposed Next Steps

October 2006

Prepared by Kathie Doty, Hennepin County / University of
Minnesota Liaison

In conjunction with:

Richard P. Johnson, Deputy County Administrator
Hennepin County

Tom Scott, Director of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs
University of Minnesota

HENNEPIN
COUNTY

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MINNESOTA

Acknowledgements

The Hennepin-University Partnership was formed in late 2004 with the creation of a liaison position to build a strategic partnership between the State's most populous local unit of government, Hennepin County and the State's premier institution for research and higher education, the University of Minnesota.

Leaders from both organizations provided the vision for this unique partnership between local government and the University and provided resources to make the partnership come to fruition.

Key leaders responsible for the creation of the partnership include:

Hennepin County

Commissioner Randy Johnson, Board Chair
Commissioner Linda Koblick, lead commissioner for the Partnership
Sandy Vargas, County Administrator
Richard P. Johnson, Deputy County Administrator

University of Minnesota

Robert Bruininks, President
Robert Jones, Senior Vice President of Systems Administration
Tom Scott, Director, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs

Other leaders contributed over the past several years to the concept of a stronger connection between Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota, including Sandy Garderbring, former Vice President for University Relations, and Hennepin County Commissioners Dorfman, McLaughlin, Opat, Steele, and Stenglein. Patrick O'Connor, former Director of the Hennepin County Taxpayer Services, designed the funding strategy to launch the Partnership.

CURA RESOURCE COLLECTION

**Center for Urban and Regional Affairs
University of Minnesota
330 Humphrey Center**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
I. Background	1
o What is the Hennepin-University Partnership?	
o Why Collaborate?	
o History of Collaboration between the County and the University	
o Making it Happen	
II. Progress to Date	5
o Increased Understanding	
o Connections Made or In Progress	
▪ Major Initiatives	
▪ Other Connections	
▪ Future Connections	
o Other Accomplishments	
III. Assessment of the Partnership	15
o Lessons Learned	
o Learning from Current Thinking on University-Community Partnerships	
▪ Pew Partnership for Civic Change	
▪ Kenneth Reardon: Straight A's? Evaluation the Success of Community/University Development Partnerships	
o Understanding How Innovations Take Root	
o The University Perspective on Engagement	
o Long Range Goal: University and Hennepin "Fully Engaged"	
IV. Proposed Next Steps	25
<u>Appendices:</u>	27
A: Pew Partnership for Civic Change; Solutions for America Report	
B: Existing Collaborations Report 2000 – 2004: A Report Cataloguing Collaborative Projects between Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota from 2000 to 2004	
C: Two Different Worlds: Community and University	
D: Kenneth Reardon's article, Straight A's? Evaluation the Success of Community/University Development Partnerships	
E: Civic Engagement Task Force Final Report	
F: Humphrey Institute Graduate Student Capstone Project Report	
G: A New Era of Higher Education-Community Partnerships: The Role and Impact of Colleges and Universities in Greater Boston Today	

Executive Summary

In late 2004, Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota launched a broad initiative to capture value for both organizations through a more strategic collaboration—connecting the two organizations where mutual benefit can be found. This includes collaboration on community-based research, sharing of academic and practitioner expertise, and providing students with valuable real-world experience.

A critical component to the success of such a collaboration – support from leadership – was in place from the initiation of the Hennepin-University Partnership. Chair of the Hennepin County Board, Randy Johnson, and County Commissioner Linda Koblick joined President Bruininks and Senior Vice President Robert Jones to ensure that necessary funding was in place to launch the Partnership. Top managers from both organizations, Richard P. Johnson, Hennepin Deputy County Administrator and Tom Scott, Director of the University of Minnesota Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, agreed to oversee the formation of the Partnership and to guide its development. A leadership forum was held in March 2005 to bring together policy makers, key managers, and academic leaders to demonstrate support for and to officially launch the Partnership.

Since the inception of the Partnership, significant groundwork has been laid for productive connections. A baseline of connections occurring prior to the inception of the Hennepin-University Partnership was built to clarify the starting point, and an identity and structure were created to support and promote stronger connections through the Partnership. Key partnering projects that have been supported by the Partnership include:

❖ Northside Partnership

The University and Hennepin are working in partnership on a major effort to assist the community on the Northside of Minneapolis to maximize the health, vitality, and promise of north Minneapolis neighborhoods. There are several components of this initiative, including significant collaboration between the Northpoint Health & Wellness Center and the planned University Family Center.

❖ Transitway Impacts Research

In early-2005, the County and the University began discussions about their mutual interest in research to measure the impacts of transitways such as the Hiawatha light rail line on the surrounding community. A first step was a joint effort to better understand existing efforts to measure impacts, such as the Metropolitan Council's work to measure before and after impacts of the Hiawatha light rail line. Over time, the effort grew into a plan to coordinate regional partners involved in planning and developing major transitway projects around academic research to measure impacts. The vision for this program will be to leverage the resources and know-how of governmental entities planning and building transitways to work in conjunction with the University of Minnesota to conduct locally relevant and

nationally-recognized academic research on the impact of transitways on the surrounding community.

❖ Public Health Research: SHAPE survey

Hennepin County is partnering with the University School of Public Health to conduct a comprehensive survey of the health of county residents – the SHAPE survey (Survey of the Health of All the Population and the Environment). The Hennepin-University Partnership supported a partnership approach to this work, which had been previously structured as a purchase of services relationship. In addition to streamlining the connection, this change also resulted in the University contributing significant in-kind and financial support to the effort. Another benefit is that researchers from the University Academic Health Center's Office of Clinical Research are now very interested in SHAPE data both for their own research and for use for student projects.

❖ Sharing of Expertise

While academics and practitioners have historically shared expertise, the Hennepin-University Partnership supports an increase in this low-cost, high-benefit activity. Some recent examples of exchange include:

- Hennepin County Commissioner Gail Dorfman joined the 2006-2007 Steering Committee for the University Center for Excellence in Children's Mental Health
- Hennepin County manager, Carol Miller joined the Advisory Board for the University Center for Early Education and Development in 2006
- Hennepin County officials and staff have been invited as key contributors to participate in a series of seminars to initiate the new Center for Integrative Leadership, a collaboration of the Carlson School of Management and the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs

A range of other connections has been made through the Hennepin-University Partnership, and potential for greater outcomes is considerable as both entities make collaboration for mutual benefit an organizational priority.

An objective in the initial phase of the Partnership was to explore the potential for connections between universities and units of government. Through reviewing recent literature on this topic and tapping into expertise at the University, principles of effective partnering between a university and a governmental unit have been identified. For example, successful collaborations require that both parties perceive mutual benefits; leadership and visible support must be in place; commitment to the partnership should be long-term; and both parties must be flexible and willing to adapt as the partnership grows.

These principles and strategies were applied to what was learned since the inception of the Hennepin-University Partnership and a list of proposed next steps were developed to take the Partnership to the next phase of collaboration.

Proposed next steps include engaging University faculty through demonstrating benefits and providing incentives; expanding the leadership team that supports the Partnership; and establishing a stronger 'front door' function. In addition, the Hennepin-University Partnership should continue to learn more about community-university collaborations to build upon best practices in this emerging area.

Through these steps, it is hoped that the Hennepin-University Partnership will increase their strategic connection, resulting in greater benefits to both organizations and to the communities they serve.

I. BACKGROUND

What is the Hennepin-University Partnership?

Hennepin County is the largest unit of local government in Minnesota with 12,700 employees and a \$1.8 billion annual operating budget. Nearly one quarter of the State's and half the metro area population resides within Hennepin County. The University of Minnesota is the state's premier research and higher education institution – it is considered "the economic engine of the State" and has an enrollment of more than 50,000 students. It is also one of the few land-grant universities in the United States that is located in a major urban area.

In late 2004, Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota launched a broad initiative to capture value for both organizations through a more strategic collaboration—connecting the two organizations where mutual benefit can be found. This includes collaboration on community-based research, sharing of academic and practitioner expertise, and providing students with valuable real-world experience.

The Partnership includes critical support from the leadership of both organizations, as well as strong support from line managers and academicians. The vision is to make the connection between the State's premier research institution and the largest county more strategic — to build from existing and historical collaborations toward a sustained and productive connection.

Vision Statement

The Hennepin-University Partnership is a strategic alignment between the state's primary research university and the state's largest county – focusing on *connecting where it counts*.

Why Collaborate?

There are many reasons to strengthen the connection between the University and Hennepin County, and much has been written over the past few years about why such university-community connections are becoming increasingly important to both. Some of the benefits that the Hennepin-University Partnership hopes to experience include the following:

University benefits

- Opportunities for faculty to apply their skills and knowledge to urgent, real-world challenges – particularly those just outside their door
- Supports initiation of research that is relevant to community needs, and publication of research findings with significant community importance

- Makes subject matter which is taught more relevant to everyday issues and therefore of greater value to students
- Develops stronger public and legislative support for research and higher education
- Generates resources for research and education
- From the larger perspective, "renews the land grant tradition of the university in contemporary terms" (Harry Boyt, University of Minnesota)

County benefits:

- Promotes evidenced-based practices and decision making
- Creates opportunities for the county to influence the decision about what gets researched – and increases the relevancy of academic research
- Connects the county to future work force and provides opportunities to ensure that this work force is knowledgeable about important public policy issues as well as governmental operations
- Supports greater access to academic experts
- Provides opportunities to share practitioner expertise in an academic setting

Others have identified benefits accruing from university-community partnerships. The Pew Partnership for Civic Change commissioned a report on this topic which concluded that *"there is no doubt that developing stronger university-community partnerships [takes] time, investment, and hard work. But the payoff is real and worthwhile: to collaboratively build knowledge that in turn improves practice and ultimately translates into stronger communities overall."* (Appendix A)

History of Collaboration between the County and the University

The Partnership builds on the strength of numerous connections between staff from both organizations that have developed primarily through individual initiative over the past several years. A key first step of the Partnership was to document the recent history of collaborations. The result of this work is a report that shows more than 80 individual collaborations that occurred between 2000 and early 2005 (Appendix B). The types of collaborations undertaken in this period include collaborative research involving students, faculty, County staff, or County Board members; sharing of professional expertise; informal connections between University faculty and their former students who are now working for Hennepin County; and serving on advisory boards for each others' projects.

While the County and the University have collaborated on many projects and programs in the past, the interaction and contact has been primarily driven by individual initiative as opposed to institutional priorities and norms.

Making it Happen

Leadership

A critical component to the success of such a collaboration – strong leadership – was in place from the initiation of the Hennepin-University Partnership. Chair of the County Board, Randy Johnson, and Commissioner Linda Koblick joined President Bruininks and Senior Vice President Robert Jones in providing necessary funding to launch the Partnership. Top managers from both organizations, Richard P. Johnson and Tom Scott, agreed to oversee the formation of the Partnership and to guide its development. A leadership forum was held in March 2005 to bring together policy makers, key managers, and academic leaders in order to demonstrate support for the Partnership.

Liaison Position

The creation of a liaison position funded jointly by the University and the County demonstrated the intent of both organizations to move collaboration to a new level. The liaison position was created to catalyze and support growing collaboration in areas where mutual benefit can be found. The Liaison works both on identifying and supporting emerging projects, as well as on creating institutional change required to sustain a stronger relationship between the two organizations. A key objective is to instill the value of collaboration into each respective organization such that a collaborative approach becomes an institutional norm rather than the result of exceptional individual effort.

The Liaison reports to a leadership team comprised of the Hennepin County Deputy County Administrator and the University's Director of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs. In addition, the Liaison is responsible for working directly with the County Board and regular communication with key deans, directors, and faculty at the University.

II. PROGRESS TO DATE

While the Hennepin-University Partnership has been in place for less than two years, this effort has resulted in significant progress toward enhancing existing connections between Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota, and toward building a stronger and more productive partnership that achieves outcomes for both entities.

Getting to Know You... Increased Understanding

One key outcome of the Partnership is that both entities have a better understanding of how an effective partnership can be achieved between a local governmental unit and an educational/research institution. There is greater awareness of the differences in the mission and organizational structure of each entity, and how to manage within the culture differences that naturally exist. As each entity learns more about the other, the probability of making a connection work for both sides is enhanced. Expectations change as understanding increases – and become more realistic. As experience and know-how grows, Hennepin staff understand that, while the University has many valuable offerings, its primary mission is not providing quick-response, consultant-like professional services at a low price (though this type of service is offered in some cases); likewise, University faculty and staff are more aware that Hennepin County functions within a political landscape which dictates accountability to the citizenry through delivery of results within fairly short time frames.

Connections Made or In Progress

Major Initiatives

A first task of the Liaison was to work with both Hennepin and the University to identify possible projects where both entities had a high level of interest, where there were staff involved from both entities that could devote time to a joint effort, and where value to the community would result from the connection. Two initiatives met these criteria, and have become substantial joint efforts:

1) Northside Partnership

The Northside of the City of Minneapolis has been identified as one of the more economically challenged parts of the Twin Cities area. Both Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota have long histories of providing services to and working with the Northside community to address social challenges. Hennepin County operates a health facility on the Northside, the Northpoint Health and Wellness Center, and also provides social services through The Village Social Services as well as a range of other services. The University has not historically had an institutional presence on the Northside; however, many faculty projects and connections have occurred over the past years.

In mid-2004, as part of a renewed commitment to community engagement that came about through their strategic positioning process, the University began to establish a stronger and more deliberate commitment to working with the Northside community on community improvements. An initiative called the University Northside Partnership (UNP) was created as a framework for a variety of programs and initiatives. The University stated its goal is to work in partnership with the community to create and support programs that:

- improve school and learning outcomes for young children;
- help with job training and business opportunities;
- provide treatment and research to children and families struggling with depression, child abuse, violence and other problems;
- increase access to higher education; and
- meet the identified needs and interests of the community.

A major element of the UNP will be a facility called the University Family Center which will serve as both a research and clinical facility and will be led by Dr. Dante Cicchetti, a world renowned developmental psychopathologist.

The University of Minnesota and Hennepin County are working in partnership on Northside initiatives in several ways. Northpoint and the University's planned Family Center are working very closely to develop plans for the Center that will leverage the strengths of both Northpoint and the University to better serve the mental health needs of the community. In addition, University and County employees are working jointly on early childhood education, improving school success in older children, nutrition education, and a range of other programs with aims to improve the quality of life on the Northside.

The formation of the Hennepin-University Partnership in late 2004 provided added momentum and leadership support to the work of both entities, as well as a way for the entities to connect beyond the parameters of specific programs. The Partnership continues to support the work of both entities and provides a mechanism for communication and joint problem solving when needed. The complexity and scope of the work on the Northside is such that coordination is a significant and on-going challenge - the Partnership contributes to such coordination efforts.

2) Research on Transitway Impacts

Hennepin County assumed a lead role in planning for and bringing to fruition the state's first light rail line, the Hiawatha line. This transit project has been recognized locally and nationally as a highly successful transit line, exceeding ridership projections by substantial margins. In addition to achieving travel time improvements for the area it serves, the light rail line is also expected to stimulate significant economic and community impacts, such as increased property values, growth in business activity and jobs, and enhanced community development. The Metropolitan Council is responsible for

submitting a compliance report to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) about such impacts, and has compiled and analyzed data from a wide variety of sources in order to meet this responsibility. However, since the Council must focus on meeting FTA requirements within budget constraints, some important public policy questions will not be fully addressed. In addition, the issue of transitway impacts goes beyond the Hiawatha line. At present, within the metropolitan region, two additional light rail lines, two commuter rail lines, and three busways are being studied or planned at this time. There is a need to engage multiple entities in collaborating around issues of data collection, management, and access in order to broaden the analysis of transitway impacts.

In mid -2005, the County and the University partnered to conduct a review of present efforts to collect and analyze data that measures transitway impacts for the Hiawatha line. This effort resulted in a report, Inventory of Data and Research on the Economic and Community Impacts of the Hiawatha LRT. The report recommends coordination of various data collection and analysis efforts currently underway, greater consistency and quality control over such efforts, strengthened data collection efforts to measure key residential, commercial, and neighborhood effects, and expansion of the analysis of key measures in order to support a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the range of impacts. Subsequent discussions between leaders from Hennepin County, three University departments (HHH Institute, Center for Transportation Studies, and Center for Urban and Regional Affairs), and Metropolitan Council/Metro Transit led to a more detailed program proposal. This proposal called for establishing a Program Management Team and Technical Advisory Group to develop a collaborative approach to improving data management and research activities, and to gain federal or other funding for major research. In order to make sure this effort moves forward without delay, equal funding was contributed by Hennepin County and the University for first-year activities. While Hennepin and the University have provided the seed money to start this program, the plan is to engage other counties and agencies benefiting from this work to actively participate as well.

The vision for this program will be to leverage the resources and know-how of governmental entities planning and building transitways to work in conjunction with the University of Minnesota to conduct locally relevant and nationally-recognized academic research on the impact of transitways on the surrounding community. This work is still in the initial phase, but to date, the response from potential partners has been very positive.

Other Connections

In addition to major projects, numerous connections are being made between Hennepin County managers and U faculty member to share expertise, find ways

to effectively engage students in practical applications of their studies, and explore joint research on the challenging issues facing local government.

1) Connecting Events

Several events have been sponsored by the Partnership to promote informal connections and to foster the exchange of expertise. Events held on the following topics since the Partnership's inception include: Children's Mental Health, Boys Reading, and Measuring Transit Impacts. Upcoming event topics include Female Offenders and School Success.

2) Joint Programs

While the County and the University often connect around research and education, they also connect around achieving other program objectives. Some examples include:

a) Humphrey Institute International Fellows Program

The Humphrey Institute International Fellows Program brings accomplished mid-career professionals from developing nations and emerging democracies to the United States for a year of academic study, related professional experience and cultural exchange. During the 2004-2005 academic year, University Coordinators of this Program sought out a connection with Hennepin County as a placement site for one of their fellows. This connection blossomed into a much broader and more formal connection that is of benefit to both entities. To provide an overview of county operations to each in-coming group of fellows, the County has developed a day-long introduction to Hennepin County that features presentations from a range of county departments as well as an opportunity to connect directly with County Commissioners and Administrators. The success of this event has been recognized by the Program as one of the most valued offerings to in-coming fellows. In addition, fellows are more likely to seek placement with Hennepin County departments, which brings cross-cultural exchange opportunities to Hennepin. With the support of leadership in both institutions, this connection continues to grow and expand to the benefit of all involved.

b) Hennepin County Service Corps

Hennepin County staff met with University faculty and staff to determine whether a partnership could be developed to support "Hennepin County Service Corps" positions at Hennepin County for recent college graduates. The County allocated funds to initiate this program and the University is working with the County to help to recruit candidates and provide support to the effort. This program is not just for University graduates, but the University has made it possible for them to have a prepaid tuition account set up so that Hennepin County can provide an education award if they choose to attend the U.

3) Joint Research

a) SHAPE survey

Hennepin County partnered with other agencies in 1998 and 2002 to conduct a comprehensive survey of the health of county residents – the SHAPE survey (Survey of the Health of All the Population and the Environment). The University's School of Public Health performed survey work in 1998 and 2002 on behalf of Hennepin County and its partners under a contractual relationship. As they planned to conduct SHAPE 2006, County staff approached the Liaison with the concept of transforming the relationship between Hennepin County and the University from a 'purchase of services' relationship to a partnership relationship. This concept was embraced by both entities and resulted in a streamlined process for initiating the survey work, and also resulted in the University contributing both in-kind and financial support to the effort. The University's Office of the Senior Vice President for System Administration contributed significant funding to help expand the survey sampling of children such that more useful analysis of children's health will be possible. A larger sample of children will allow a break down by race/ethnicity and across geographic segments (e.g. North Minneapolis).

With support from the Hennepin-University Partnership, county staff working on the SHAPE survey also connected with researchers from the University Academic Health Center's Office of Clinical Research who expressed interest in the data to be collected through SHAPE 2006, both for their own research and for use with student projects. Future connections should be supported to find mutual benefit around this rich source of public health data.

b) Access to Destinations

Transportation researchers and professionals have several questions about the traffic congestion that is causing concern in the Metro Area. For example, very little is known about how congestion varies by location, time, and condition, and how it impacts local roads. Less is known about how congestion affects people's travel patterns and how it influences residential or firm location decisions. People travel to reach destinations for many activities, such as work, shopping, education, and recreation. Typical measures of congestion describe only how fast people travel relative to a determined baseline speed, and do not describe whether people's ability to access destinations has worsened.

To respond to important policy questions, the University Center for Transportation Studies is overseeing a major research project, Access to Destinations. This study has three major research objectives: 1) Improve our understanding of travel on freeways, arterials, and other roadways and of

travel by non-auto modes, including transit, bicycling, and walking; 2) Develop measures of accessibility using travel and land use data, then using new tools and information, assess how our existing transportation and land use system meets alternative policy goals, and evaluate policy options related to investments in different transportation modes or changes in land use practices.

Hennepin County was invited to assist in shaping the study and to actively participate in two of five research components of Access to Destinations: measuring the efficiency of county roads (arterials) and better understanding non-motorized travel impacts (e.g. bike and pedestrian travel). Gary Erickson, Hennepin County Director of Public Works, commented at a kick-off event in May 2006, that this study represents an expanded partnership between Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota; by establishing a more formal working relationship, Hennepin County expects to benefit from the University's research capabilities while contributing a practical perspective on issues like development and public policy.

4) Sharing of Expertise

While sharing of expertise between the County and the University is not uncommon, there is a sense that this low-cost, high-value activity could be happening more often – to the benefit of both entities. Some key examples of exchange include:

- Hennepin County Commissioner Gail Dorfman is on the 2006-2007 Steering Committee for the University Center for Excellence in Children's Mental Health
- Hennepin County staff Carol Miller joined the Advisory Board for the University Center for Early Education and Development in 2006
- Hennepin County officials and staff have been invited as key contributors to participate in a series of seminars to initiate the new Center for Integrative Leadership, a collaboration of the Carlson School of Management and the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
- Experts from the University Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering were invited by the Hennepin County Environmental Services to provide ideas about controlling odors from a County waste-to-energy facility
- Hennepin County Northpoint Health & Wellness Center Director Gary Cunningham exchanged expertise on a range of issues with faculty from the University Academic Health Center and the Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs
- Hennepin County Director of Public Affairs has been a guest lecturer in University School of Journalism and Mass Communication classes

These are just a few examples of exchange of expertise which have occurred since the inception of the Hennepin-University Partnership and which demonstrate that both entities can benefit from such exchanges.

Future Connections

The following examples show early phase connections where relationships are being developed with the objective of finding value in the future:

1) Hennepin County Environmental Services and the University President's Initiative on the Environmental and Renewable Energy

A county manager from the Environmental Services Department has made contact with the University staff person leading the President's Initiative on the Environmental and Renewable Energy. The growing interest of both entities in issues related to the environment may evolve into joint work.

2) Research with SHAPE data

Hennepin County staff presented information about SHAPE data to University researchers from the Medical School in early 2006 (SHAPE is a major survey of the health of Hennepin County residents). Researchers expressed considerable interest in the data that will be produced by this survey both for research purposes as well as for student projects.

3) Children and Families Research Agenda

Representatives from the Hennepin County Departments of Human Services and Public Health (HSPHD) and the Strategic Initiatives and Community Engagement (SICED) have had initial discussions with the University's Children, Youth, and Families Consortium (CYFC), the Institute of Child Development (ICD), and the Gamble-Skogmo Land Grant Chair in Child Welfare and Youth Policy. The goal is to strengthen the connection between Hennepin County and the University in the area of children and families, starting with better communications about the goals of each entity. The Liaison is presently working with both entities to develop a mechanism for more thoughtful and deliberate exchange of information that will lead to increased collaboration in areas of interest to both entities.

3) Homeless Housing

Hennepin County Commissioner Gail Dorfman attended a presentation of student projects displaying ideas for housing for homeless people held at the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture (CALA). She connected with the CALA dean as well as with CALA students working on designs for housing for the homeless, and has indicated that she plans to follow up with at least one of the students.

4) Senior Services at Libraries

The Hennepin County Library is creating a stronger focus on serving seniors in response to changing demographics of the community they serve. A preliminary contact was made between the School of Nursing and a Hennepin County Library manager to explore possible projects for graduate level nursing students.

5) West Broadway Avenue Student Project

A class at the U's College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture (CALA) has undertaken a student review of 'place issues' around a planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station in North Minneapolis and along the Bottineau Blvd BRT line. CALA faculty have explored a possible connection with Hennepin County staff from the Housing, Community Works and Transit Department, as well as from the Transportation Department as they bring in experts to talk to the class about how the transit station and the area surrounding can be developed with community interests in mind.

6) Hennepin County Satellite Service Center on Campus

Hennepin County operates service centers at several locations in the County to provide licensing services to residents. Recent experimentation with a satellite site at the Hennepin County Medical Center has shown success for this model of providing services. County staff have approached University Services to explore the possible location of a satellite licensing service at a convenient location on the Minneapolis campus.

Other Accomplishments

In order to support greater understanding of the Partnership vision and to increase connections between Hennepin and the University, the following efforts were undertaken:

1) Building Connections through the Hennepin-University Partnership Liaison

Since the inception of the Partnership, the Liaison has contacted and met with more than 80 policy makers, managers, faculty, and program directors to promote collaboration and to find ways to support connections of mutual benefit to Hennepin County and the University (Appendix B).

The Liaison maintains contacts with Hennepin leadership through periodic County Board briefings, and participation in the County's Department Directors monthly meetings. In addition, connections with key University centers that focus on metropolitan issues and outreach have been developed and maintained; the Liaison interacts regularly with the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, the Children, Youth, and Families Consortium, the Center for Transportation Studies, the Community Relations Director, and the Communicators Forum, in addition to key individuals at schools such as the

Hubert H. Humphrey Institute, School of Social Work, College of Education, the Urban Extension program, and others.

The Liaison also seeks out and makes connections with other initiatives that connect local government to University resources such as the Association of Minnesota Counties Extension and the City of Minneapolis' Council initiative.

2) Hennepin-University Partnership Web Pages

To provide basic information about the Partnership and to begin to provide resources to promote collaboration, a series of web pages were developed on the Hennepin County web site (www.hennepin.us) and the CURA web site (www.cura.umn.edu/HUP.php). It is clear from feedback of staff from both entities that additional tools to help with finding expertise and matching interests would be of value; the Liaison is working to create an Hennepin-University Partnership web site that better addresses this need.

3) Projects Database

As part of the work to establish a baseline of connections by documenting collaborations between Hennepin County and the University initiated from 2000 – 2004, a table of projects was created. This format was expanded to add information on connections that occurred after 2004 to create an on-going record of connections that can be used to provide information about the level of connection, and to support measurement of progress. The table of existing collaborations is being converted to a database that will allow for searches to meet a variety of needs (e.g. models of collaboration for transit projects; collaborations that have yielded grant funding; etc).

4) Contract Streamlining

Hennepin County and the University are large, complex organizations with sometimes frustrating and time-consuming processes for developing the formal agreements that significant collaborative activities require. Staff and faculty have identified the contracting process as a major barrier to collaboration. The Liaison is working with both entities to find ways to streamline the contracting process to minimize this impediment. From Hennepin County, participants include the central procurement division (Purchasing & Contract Services) and the Human Services & Public Health Department procurement office. From the University, participants include both the Special Projects Administration (SPA) and the External Projects office. The goal is to work with all of these entities to develop a master contract that will meet their various needs and will reduce the time and effort required to develop a contract between the County and the University.

5) Outreach Efforts

Communicating about the Hennepin-University Partnership is critical to raise awareness and to engage potential collaborators. Newsletters (SMARTLINK) and project briefs (CWIC Notes) have been produced, as well as a PowerPoint presentation and summary materials for specific audiences. Future efforts will focus on more effective communications at the University – anecdotal information indicates that many faculty are not aware of the Partnership as a program, and do not know how to access support when they wish to explore a connection with Hennepin County. Other planned efforts include: presenting information about the Partnership at the University's fall retreats and new faculty orientations; creating topic-based lists of staff and faculty so that potential connections will be more visible; becoming more involved in the University's Communicators Forum to access ways to better connect with individual departments, schools, colleges, and institutes.

III. ASSESSEMENT OF PARTNERSHIP

Lessons Learned

Much has been accomplished since the inception of the Hennepin-University Partnership, due in large part to support from leadership of both entities. In addition to making progress, much has been learned about how to increase effective collaboration – in some cases, the learning has come from studying what does not work so well. The following examples show how lessons can come from less-than-successful connections:

1) Finding the RIGHT Experts

University researchers offer expertise on a wide range of topics, but individual researchers often focus on narrowly defined issues within a general area of interest. For example, researchers may work on poverty issues, but not in a way that can inform the County's quest to eliminate 'intergenerational poverty.' In early 2005, the Liaison worked with County and University representatives to convene a meeting of researchers from the Humphrey Institute, the Department of Applied Economics, the Center for Race and Poverty, and the School of Social Work to explore ways to share knowledge and current thinking about intergenerational poverty with the County Administrator and key county staff. While the faculty had useful ideas to offer, those in attendance indicated that their areas of expertise and research were not very relevant to the County's action-oriented goals of changing the social structures that support intergenerational poverty.

The participants in this meeting learned that academic expertise can be quite narrow in scope given the nature of academic endeavor. Many researchers spend their careers probing deeper into a particular issue, and thereby discovering new and important information about that issue. While this is certainly not true for all researchers, some are less interested in relating their sphere of knowledge to broader policy issues. Knowing this, the Partnership should 1) continue to help county managers find researchers with expertise that can be applied in a 'real world' setting; and 2) help the County shape its research agenda so that the University better understands and can respond, over time, to the needs of the County.

2) Culture Clash

As experience in many University-community connections shows, one key challenge is differences in organizational culture between academic institutions and community/governmental organizations. These are described as "Two Different Worlds" in a best practices brief prepared by Michigan State University (Appendix C). According to this publication, "University faculty and staff, and community agency staff function in two separate worlds that differ in primary mission, culture, expectations, and motivation. Would-be partners consequently tend to misperceive the parameters within which the other

operates. In engaging with communities, university faculty and staff need to understand the context in which community agencies operate. Similarly, communities need to understand the limitations for university faculty and staff and what they can and cannot deliver."

The following situations illustrate how the culture clash between Hennepin and the University can present challenges, but also how the cultural differences can be relatively easily overcome:

a. Culture Clash I: Soon is not Soon

A Hennepin County program working with parents who are at risk of losing their parental rights due to neglect and abuse issues wished to find expertise at the University to develop a measurement tool that would gauge improvements in parenting skills. The County staff person working on this asked for assistance from a University program that was established to help connect University researchers to community needs. The University program successfully identified researchers interested in this work, but did not get the meeting set up in a timely fashion – or at least not timely for the County manager wishing to work with the University. The Liaison became involved when the University contact expressed frustration about being unappreciated by the County for the work that had been done. Since the Liaison had experienced culture clash issues around time perceptions previously, she suspected that, with no specific date/time agreed upon for scheduling the meeting, the County person correctly assumed that the meeting would occur 'soon' (within the few weeks), while the University contact also correctly assumed that the meeting could be convened 'soon' (within the next 3 months or so, and depending on the academic calendar).

The meeting was eventually convened, the right researchers were in attendance, and a fruitful exchange occurred. What was learned, however, was that continuous efforts are needed to remind professionals from both entities that their cultures are quite different and that the best way to manage this is to be specific about what the goals and expectations are early on. In this way, misunderstandings are minimized, and the relationship-building component that is essential for successful collaborations can take root.

b. Culture Clash II: The Rhythm of the U

The University functions with a distinct rhythm that reflects the academic year. The beginning of the Fall and Spring semesters are very busy as faculty get their classes started. The ends of the semesters are also quite frenzied as finals and term papers must be graded and posted. The summer is quieter while many faculty who have 9-month appointments are off or on sabbatical. Given this, University faculty often plan their schedules quite far into the future, and many are 'booked' at least two years out.

Students want good internships, but are often available on a semester basis, with gaps in their availability corresponding to mid-term and finals deadlines.

For County managers who are not tuned in to this rhythm, it can be a confusing and frustrating barrier to connecting with researchers and for working with students. County managers often need expertise and student assistance with relatively little warning. The Hennepin-University Partnership Liaison experiences the dilemma of different organizational rhythms when she is contacted by a County staff person who needs some help "by the end of the week." The goal for the Partnership is to turn a potentially negative event into a learning opportunity. The Liaison works with County departments to encourage top and mid-level managers to explore possible connections with programs at the University where there may be mutual interest and to build relationships with researchers working on areas that may relate to the county mission. With a relationship in place, connections between the County and the University can be much more productive. When time has been invested to build a relationship, quick response to County needs is much more likely to occur. In fact, the concept of successful collaborative efforts growing out of collegial relationships between academicians and practitioners and developed over time has become a central focus of the Partnership.

3) Ideas Without Partners

The existence of the Hennepin-University Partnership has been a catalyst for a plethora of excellent ideas on how the County and the University can connect for mutual benefit. However, practical issues in terms of availability of resources and matching interests presents an on-going challenge. It has not been uncommon during the initial phase of the Partnership for either a County or a University representative to articulate an engaging idea for a collaboration, but be unable to find a partner on the other side of the equation to work with them. This is a frustrating challenge which could be addressed in part with a more structured and systematic approach to collaboration. Just the act of creating a list of potential projects that are vetted with leaders from both entities may serve to: a) better communicate about interests, such that finding a matching interest is more likely, and b) acknowledge the importance of a potential project, such that it doesn't drop off the radar screen altogether.

In addition, attracting partners can be greatly facilitated if there are funds dedicated to supporting collaborative activities. Matching grant programs can be an effective way to engage researchers and county managers, and to compensate for the extra effort required to initiate a successful collaboration.

Learning from Current Thinking on University-Community Partnerships

Pew Partnership for Civic Change

According to the Pew Partnership for Civic Change's Report, *University + Community Research Partnerships* (and consistent with the lessons learned through the Hennepin-University Partnership), there are three steps that must be taken to further such partnerships:

Increase Access. Connecting faculty and practitioners will rarely occur without deliberate and conscious efforts to knock down the barriers between the university and the community. Increasing access is the first step toward building effective collaborations.

Create Rewards. Incentives such as stipends for community research, acknowledging the value of community research within the higher education community, and providing resources to defray the costs of research for community-based organizations go a long way toward catalyzing such partnerships.

Increase Visibility. Successful models exist for connecting higher education and communities around research. However, what is often lacking is visibility that spotlights the potential of these partnerships and inspires stakeholders to launch their own partnerships.

In the case of the Hennepin-University Partnership, the focus of the first two years has been on increasing access and visibility. Specific actions included the creation of liaison position and subsequent efforts to increase awareness of the Partnership within both organizations and to facilitate and catalyze more connections. To continue to build upon the groundwork laid since the inception of the Partnership, focus will need to be on building infrastructure to support and reward collaboration in areas of mutual interest.

Kenneth Reardon: Straight A's? Evaluating the Success of Community/University Development Partnerships

Though there has been much written on the elements of successful collaborations, one of the more succinct and relevant writings in the recent past was authored by Dr. Kenneth Reardon of Cornell University, a nationally recognized expert on university- community partnerships (Appendix D). He lists five elements which are summarized as follows:

1) Clear Understanding of Mutual Benefits

Partnerships that do not allow both parties to achieve their institutional self-interests do not survive. Both the community and the campus must be clear about their respective institutional self-interests, and comparable benefits for both the academic and the community partners must be gained.

- ✓ Regarding the Hennepin-University Partnership, the self interest of both entities has been articulated from the outset of the Partnership. As outlined on p. 6, both the University and the County see significant potential benefits from a stronger collaboration.

2) Leadership & Visible Support

Successful partnerships require significant executive leadership and often visible support from the university president, the mayor, the Chamber of Commerce director, respected members of the labor community, and elders from the community's major religious denominations.

- ✓ Executive leadership from both entities has been strong and visible as evidenced by:
 - a. March 2005 Kick off Forum: President Bruininks, Commissioners Johnson and Koblick
 - b. Chair Randy Johnson highlights the Hennepin-University Partnership in 2005 and 2006 State of the County speeches, and President Bruininks speaks at 2005 State of the County presentation, held on the U campus
 - c. Senior Vice President Robert Jones presents to County Board on multiple occasions: May 12, 2005; October 31, 2005; April 6, 2006
 - d. Commissioner Koblick makes opening comments at Boys Reading Event and other joint meetings
 - e. Commissioner Dorfman makes comments at joint Children's' Mental Health event, and joins the University's Advisory Board for the Center for Excellence in Children's Mental Health
 - f. Commissioner McLaughlin makes opening comments at a workshop on measuring the impacts of transitways in June 2005
 - g. Senior Vice president Jones provides funds to significantly expand County-initiated and nationally recognized survey on the health of the community

3) Organizational Boundary-Crossers

Organizational boundary-crossers play a pivotal role. These individuals occupy key leadership positions within their own organizations but also understand the history, culture, structure, and operation of their partnering organizations.

- ✓ Organizational boundary-crossers exist within both entities – just a few examples of individuals who have a history of connecting on projects of mutual interest:
 - From Hennepin: Gretchen Wronka, Fred LaFleur, Luanne Nyberg, Gary Cunningham, Carol Miller, Pat O'Connor, Steve Louie
 - From the University: Scott McConnell, Cathy Jordan, Bob Johns, Bill Doherty, Ed Goetz, Marcie Jeffreys, Kris Nelson, Tyra Darville-Layne

Much can be learned from these individuals about how to successfully initiate and sustain collaborative projects. At the start up of the Partnership, collaborations occurring between 2000 and 2004 were documented and studied to discern trends and practices that should

be held up as models for others interested in initiating a collaborative project.

A key finding of this work was that a significant portion of the historical connections between Hennepin and the University has occurred as a result of extraordinary individual initiative. While it is important to learn from these initiatives, the Partnership must go beyond expectations that extraordinary efforts will become the norm – in order to 'institutionalize' collaboration, it is imperative that we learn from Organizational Boundary Crossers, but simultaneously create systems and infrastructure to support more typical efforts.

4) Long-term Commitment

"Successful partnerships develop slowly, and significant time is required to move from the initial relationship building stage to the program implementation stage, often five to ten years". Small victories are important to build the momentum required to sustain systemic change.

- ✓ The Partnership has documented many 'small victories' as shown in Section II, and the strong support of leaders from both entities has helped to create significant momentum. In addition, two major projects have begun with significant support from the partnership: Measuring Impacts of Transitways and the University Northside Partnership.
- ✓ Long-term commitment is still being formed. An important next step will be for both entities to assess the value of the Partnership and to explore the potential for greater benefits that could accrue from a more sustained commitment.

5) Flexibility

"The willingness of both community and campus leaders to reflect upon, learn from, and adjust to challenges and mistakes appears to be a central requirement of a successful partnership"

- ✓ At the outset of the Partnership, expectations for outcomes in terms of cost-savings, efficiencies to be gained, and ready access to expertise were overly optimistic. Both entities have shown real interest in learning more about how the other operates, respect and consideration for differences, and a willingness to bend in order to make things work. One recent example of this is the strong interest and willingness of both procurement offices to work together to streamline the contracting process. Without the willingness of both entities to listen and understand the needs of the other, this effort could not go forward. The flexibility demonstrated to date bodes well

for the Partnership – genuine interest exists in learning how to work together better.

Understanding How Innovations Take Root

It is clear from experience to date that some individuals have quickly embraced the opportunities presented by the formation of the Hennepin-University Partnership, while the majority are a bit more hesitant. It is useful to review research about how institutional change comes about to get a sense of what to expect with regard to 'institutionalizing' partnership between the County and the University. Everett M. Rogers' book, *Diffusion of Innovations*, addresses how innovations come to be accepted in institutions, and notes that new innovations are not adopted by everyone at once, while some people never adopt them. According to Rogers, people fall into different categories based on their willingness to innovate.

1. **Innovators** are the smallest group at about 2.5% of the population. They are the risk takers who put themselves up in front and are willing to make mistakes and accept the consequences of their failures.
2. **Early Adopters** make up the next 13.5%. They are much like the innovators but are often more visible and respected among their peers. This group plays a key role in the adoption of innovations, determining the timing of adoptions and the extent to which adoption occurs.
3. **Early Majority** constitutes 34% of adopters. Although they do not take the risk of being the first to adopt, they do accept an innovation, although they may take some time before they fully adopt it.
4. **Late Majority** makes up 34% of the group. They are not willing to take a chance unless the majority has already fully adopted the innovation.
5. **Laggards** make up the final 16% of the group. These are the people who are more likely to look to the past than the future. They are skeptical, and if they adopt an innovation it is generally after a new innovation is already underway.

At the inception of the Hennepin-University Partnership, the Liaison was able to easily identify and connect with Innovators. They either made themselves known by contacting the Liaison or their colleagues would often mention their work. The Innovators were typically mid-level managers or individual faculty with a strong passion for their particular area of work. As efforts were made to further connect with possible collaborators from each entity and as the visibility of the Partnership increased, Early Adopters, particularly at Hennepin County, began to think about and take some actions to more effectively connect. The Early Adopters were more evident on the Hennepin County side of the equation and were typically department or division heads who perceived some kind of benefit for their part of the organization from a stronger connection to the University. Some progress to engage Early Adopters at the University has been made as well, but since the

visibility of the Partnership is not as high at the University as it is at Hennepin County, identifying and engaging Early Adopters at the University is a greater challenge. As the Hennepin-University Partnership approaches completion of its second year, Rogers' model can provide guidance with regard to the path to sustainability:

- 1) Continue to highlight and reward actions of Innovators, while understanding that their approach may not be as replicable as others. This raises the visibility of the potential benefits of collaboration to Early and Late Adopters.
- 2) Continue to engage Early Adopters at Hennepin County through work with Department and Division Heads. Provide evidence of the benefits that can accrue from collaboration with the University and work with County Administration to identify rewards for managers who incorporate collaboration with the University into their work.
- 3) Find ways to better connect with Early Adopters from the University in part through raising the visibility of the Partnership with Deans, Directors, and other leaders within individual schools. Raising visibility could occur through a range of activities including presentations to faculty groups, convening topic-related forums, and connecting individual faculty with County staff working in similar areas.
- 4) Engage those who are less willing to take risks by providing access to 'seed grant' and/or matching funds for new collaborations.

The longer-term challenge related to sustainability will be to embed the concept of collaboration into the daily functioning of the majority of project managers, faculty, and staff who whose work would be improved or enhanced through a connection to Hennepin County or the University. As research shows, it will take some time to bring about a change in the way an organization approaches its mission.

Perspective of Academic Institutions

According to a report prepared by The Boston Foundation and the University College of Citizenship and Public Service at Tufts University, collaborations between universities and the local community or local government are typically ad hoc, one-time, piecemeal, or episodic. "Relationships between civic organizations and institutions of higher learning abound, although most exist in one-to-one relationships that are primarily informal. Greater impact could occur if these types of relationships both expand and coordinate around common issues of concern..."

In 2001, Ed Fogelman, acting as Chair of the Civic Engagement Task Force, submitted a report, *Civic Engagement: Renewing the Land Grant Mission*, to President Robert Bruininks (Appendix E). This report described four parallel and inter-related dimensions for institutionalizing an Engaged University: intellectual,

structural, cultural, and political. His closing assessment of where the University of Minnesota stands with regard to public engagement was stated as follows:

"Perhaps the best assessment is that the University of Minnesota is at present a partially- engaged university; the challenge for the future is to become a fully-engaged university"

The University has initiated several significant actions to become more fully engaged since the Task Force reported to the President in 2001. Increasing the level of commitment to the Hennepin-University Partnership and making a longer-term pledge of support to the Partnership would contribute to the University's quest to become a fully-engaged university. The challenge to Hennepin and the University is to build on their existing partnership in order to move beyond episodic connections to a more sustained and strategic relationship, focusing on areas of mutual interest. An expanded and more productive relationship will need ongoing support of governmental and institutional leaders as well an organizational infrastructure to support the Partnership over time.

Long Range Goal: University and Hennepin "Fully Engaged"

Experience to date indicates that, while there are many successful connections between the County and the University, and significant interest in exploring more connections, the challenge is to embed the spirit of collaboration into the way work is conducted within both organizations to create long-term sustainability. Ultimately, the desired result is a change in the way staff from both organizations approach their work.

For Hennepin County, this change will mean that managers and other employees that are planning programs, solving problems, and finding new ways to approach their work will think about what the University may have to offer that will make their work 'smarter' by tapping into:

- Content expertise from academic specialists
- Student labor including both undergraduate and graduate students
- Research capabilities from one of the top research institutes in the county
- The value of the imprimatur of the University with regard to effecting system changes

From the University, the change in mindset will be evidenced by faculty, directors, and other key personnel considering accessing nearby Hennepin County when they need:

- Access to a 'living laboratory' for research purposes
- Practitioner expertise from those who are delivering services in the real world
- Quality community experiences for their students

- A strong partner with the capability of committing resources for important long-range initiatives

When these changes are wide-spread and well-established, the connection between Hennepin and the University will be considered robust and self-sustaining.

IV: PROPOSED NEXT STEPS

The following steps for Year Three and Four of the Hennepin-University Partnership are proposed to take the Partnership to the next phase – increasing the number and productivity of connections between Hennepin and the University, and focusing on building a connection that will be sustained over time. A study of the Hennepin-University Partnership was conducted by a group of Humphrey graduate students in early summer 2006, and this study conclude that, in order to achieve sustainability, the Partnership would need to move beyond the 'initiation phase' and into a growth phase, rooted in greater faculty and middle manager involvement (Appendix F). Developing a longer-term commitment is also important. Reports on collaborations in other parts of the country emphasize the need to develop longer-term commitment to reap the benefits of university-community connections: *"Many of the transactions between a university and its host community(ies) are ad hoc, one-time, or year-to-year interactions. This episodic approach deprives both the university and local communities of the greater benefits that they can achieve through longer-term agreements.* (Appendix G: Report from the Boston Foundation and the University College of Citizenship and Public Service at Tufts University)

Experience to date shows that objectives related to sustainability will be more about organizational change on both sides of the Partnership – embedding the concept of collaboration into the daily routine of managers, faculty, and staff - and less about generating new ideas for collaboration.

Given experience to date, and reflection on collaboration research, the following steps are proposed:

- 1) Further Development of Incentives

Research shows that incentives are needed to encourage the extra effort required to initiate a collaborative endeavor. While the cost of working with University faculty on research, program evaluation, and other projects can be very cost-effective, in many cases, faculty and research assistant costs require some type of funding. The Partnership will continue to work with County departments and University programs to identify joint projects, and assist in seeking funding to support such projects – including seeking grant and/or third-party funding.

- 2) Expanded Leadership Team

The Hennepin-University Partnership has enjoyed the strong support of both Hennepin County and University leaders. In the next phase of the Partnership, a more structured approach is suggested to move the Partnership towards sustainability. An expansion of the present Leadership Team would establish priorities for collaborative efforts and assist in providing support for new initiatives.

- 3) **Greater Engagement of University Faculty**
Effectively engaging faculty can result in long-term benefits. Faculty will be more inclined to think about partnering with Hennepin County on research of value to the community, will be more willing to provide expertise when needed by Hennepin County, will encourage their students to consider Hennepin for internships and class project sites, and will draw practitioners into the classroom to enhance learning.
The Hennepin-University Partnership should focus on raising awareness about the benefits of partnering with faculty.
- 4) **Stronger "Front Doors" for Each Organization**
The need for well-paved avenues connecting two such entities is perhaps best stated in the Pew Partnership report on University and Community Research Partnerships: "Connecting faculty and practitioners will rarely occur without deliberate and conscious efforts to knock down the barriers between the university and the community." Additional staff support is needed to reinforce the front door function of the Partnership – such that a one-stop shop can be promoted to respond to a wide-range of requests for assistance.
- 5) **Stronger Connection with University Programs**
In addition to building stronger relationships with existing University programs such as the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, the Center for Transportation Studies, the Children, Youth and Families Consortium, and the State and Local Policy Program, the Partnership should also forge a connection with two new entities, the **Metropolitan Studies Consortium** and the **Academic and Corporate Relations Center**. These represent two new University endeavors to strengthen the University's offerings to support the Metropolitan area, and to make the University more accessible to entities outside the University.
- 6) **Continue to Explore Models for Collaboration**
Much was learned from a literature review of current research and thinking about university-community partnerships. This is an emerging field of inquiry, and institutions of higher education are particularly interested in improving their contribution to the communities in which they reside and making stronger connections with those communities. The Hennepin-University Partnership should continue to monitor and participate in national discussions regarding the future and possibilities of university-community partnerships.

In closing, these steps are proposed to ensure that benefits accruing from investments made to date to strengthen the connection between Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota are fully realized. The connection between the County and the University must evolve to a "full engagement" that yields greater value for both organizations.

Appendix A: Pew Partnership for Civic Change; Solutions for America

The Pew Partnership for Civic Change is a civic research organization whose mission is to identify and disseminate promising solutions to tough community issues. Solutions for America (1999–2001) was an action research initiative of the Partnership designed to pioneer a new model of documenting best practices and communicating results.

A section of the report on this initiative summarized a discussion from a roundtable on university-community research partnerships held in October 2002, in Charlottesville, Virginia. The event was co-sponsored by the Pew Partnership for Civic Change and the University of Virginia's Office of the Vice President and Provost. More than 30 representatives from higher education, nonprofit and government practitioners, and the philanthropy community participated in the round table. (www.pew-partnership.org/pdf/university_and_community.pdf)

Findings from the Roundtable were reported as follows:

- 1: College and university faculty members reap multiple and unexpected benefits from engaging in community-based research.
- 2: Faculty engagement leads to greater university-community collaboration at the institutional level.
- 3: Increasing the accessibility of colleges and universities to community practitioners is an essential factor in building successful partnerships.
- 4: There is a demonstrated need for new networks to connect people working in the field of university-community research.
- 5: Building research relationships with faculty members yields multiple benefits for nonprofits and local governments.
- 6: Supporting collaborative research relationships between community agencies and university faculty has clear benefits for funders.

Roundtable discussion conclusions were as follows:

University-community research partnerships can be forged in any community. To realize their potential, the general consensus from the Pew Partnership's experience and the larger field is that we must do a better job connecting local organizations with higher education and vice versa. Specifically, we believe there are three steps that must be taken to further these partnerships. They are increasing access, increasing rewards, and increasing visibility.

Access. Connecting faculty and practitioners will rarely occur without deliberate and conscious efforts to knock down the barriers between the university and the community. Increasing access is the first step toward building effective collaborations.

Rewards. Practitioners and faculty can easily be lulled into focusing on their own day-to-day work, ignoring the latent potential of collaboration. Incentives such as stipends for community research, acknowledging the value of community research within the higher education community, and providing resources to defray the costs of research for community-based organizations will go a long way toward catalyzing such partnerships.

Visibility. Successful models exist for connecting higher education and communities around research. However, what is often lacking is visibility that spotlights the potential of these partnerships and inspires stakeholders to launch their own partnerships.

There is no doubt that developing stronger university-community partnerships will take time, investment, and hard work. But the payoff is real and worthwhile: to collaboratively build knowledge that in turn improves practice—and ultimately translates into stronger communities overall.

Appendix B: Existing Collaborations Report 2000 – 2004: A Report Cataloguing Collaborative Projects between Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota from 2000 to 2004

Except from the Report's Executive Summary

Overview

- More than **80 collaborations** have taken place over the past 5 years.
- The projects identified are **both formal and informal in nature**; there are many that do not operate under a contract.
- **More projects originate at Hennepin County**, but many are initiated by the University as well, and some are created jointly.

Key Themes

- Most respondents found it **difficult to quantify the dollar value** of collaborative projects. The value or benefits of collaboration are not always tangible in terms of dollar savings or quantifiable efficiencies gained.
- Several interviewees stated that their **project could not have taken place** without collaboration.
- Departments with **pre-existing connections** have found collaboration easier than those without these connections. Most of these connections result from University alumni being employed by the County, County departments regularly working with student interns and their advisors at the University, and other relationships that predate current staff, as in the cooperation of HCMC and the University Medical School. These connections have been formed through personal relationships to specific departments or faculty members, and allow for easy communication between the institutions.
- Even if a County department is seeking a different type of expertise than they have used in the past, departments with **existing connections** at the University find it easier to make new connections to other areas – it seems that once they have learned how to work with the University, the process becomes easier for other projects.

Types of Collaboration

- Collaborative research involving students, faculty, County staff, or County Board members
 - *Example: Research regarding the effectiveness of biodiesel fuels in heavy trucks in cold climates both parties were interested, collaboration allowed the research to proceed*
- Contracted consulting work, providing professional expertise and completing a project
 - *Example: African American Men Project commissioned by the County and carried out by a group of University faculty and County researchers.*
- Conversations between experts in the same field, sharing ideas and trading "tricks of the trade"
 - *Example: The transportation departments of both entities interact on a regular and on-going basis.*
- Informal connections between University faculty and their former students who are now working for Hennepin County

- Example: OPD worked with school of social work to develop research techniques for evaluating case reviews of child out-of-home placements.
- Serving on advisory boards for each others' projects
 - Example: A Hennepin County Library representative serves on the Early Learning Advisory Board for the University's Center for Early Education and Development

Observations/Analysis

- While both organizations have demonstrated interest in collaboration, **certain departments are much more active than others** when it comes to following through with proposed projects.
- **Contracting between the two agencies is a major roadblock**; more than half of the projects surveyed mentioned contracting difficulties as part of the project timeline.
- Many collaborations take place that were difficult to document **due to their informal nature**.
- Every project needs **at least one champion or advocate** to see it through and work through any problems. Projects with two champions, one on each side, proceed more quickly.
- **Timelines** are sometimes difficult to reconcile, particularly when working with students.
- This is a unique collaboration effort. The University Of Minnesota is one of the only land grant institutions to be located in an **urban area**, and Hennepin County is one of the few counties nation-wide to encompass **urban, suburban and rural land**.

Appendix C: Two Different Worlds: Community and University

"University faculty and staff, and community agency staff function in two separate worlds that differ in primary mission, culture, expectations, and motivation (Table: Two Different Worlds). Would-be partners consequently tend to misperceive the parameters within which the other operates. In engaging with communities, university faculty and staff need to understand the context in which community agencies operate. Similarly, communities need to understand the limitations for university faculty and staff and what they can and cannot deliver."

TWO DIFFERENT WORLDS

	<i>Community Agency</i>	<i>University</i>
Mission	Service	Primarily research and education
Structure	Hierarchical, pyramidal Job assignments, resources, and authorizations are determined by the immediate manager and/or the director of the agency.	Flat Individuals largely determine the primary focus of their work and how they will support their research through grants and contracts. The university structure accomplishes direction through leadership, exhortation and incentives such as contingent funding and promotion according to teaching, research, and outreach performance.
Focus	Staff are primarily outwardly directed, toward clients and community. Agency is oriented toward action.	Faculty are primarily inwardly directed, toward their research, and teaching interests, and toward reflection.
Resources	Nonprofit agencies Resources are obtained through a budgeting process (e.g., United Way) and through fundraising. May also obtain governmental grants, contracts or foundation grants. Governmental agencies Agency obtains federal and/or state allocations through a budgeting and legislative appropriations process. May also obtain foundation grants.	Universities State allocations are obtained through a budgeting and legislative appropriations process (for state institutions), and through student tuition and fundraising. Faculty generally must obtain federal, state, foundation or university grants to underwrite their research. May also obtain community, agency, or organization contracts.
Control of Time	Staff have generally assigned responsibilities and specified work time and place.	Faculty have assigned teaching and committee responsibilities, but generally manage their own time and work site.
Reimbursement	Salary is related to work week. Staff are generally constrained from undertaking parallel work for pay on their own time.	Faculty are paid for products by university (e.g. teaching, committee work) and through grants (e.g. for research). They may be encouraged to engage in outside work.
Reward system	Promotion is based on merit or amount of time in a particular grade level.	Promotion and tenure often are based on publications and other evidence of achievement, such as ability to attract outside funding.

From BEST PRACTICE BRIEFS, No. 32, April 2005. Best Practices Briefs are a product of University-Community Partnerships @ Michigan State University, connecting university resources to the community.

Appendix D: Excerpts from Kenneth Reardon's article, *Straight A's? Evaluation the Success of Community/University Development Partnerships*, Summer 2005

Dr. Kenneth Reardon of Cornell University is a nationally recognized expert on university-community partnerships. He was awarded the 2000 American Institute of Certified Planners President's Award for his role in establishing and directing the highly-regarded East St. Louis Action Research Project. His research interests focus on community-based planning in severely distressed urban neighborhoods, alternative approaches to community development, urban social movements, and municipal government reform.

"In 2001, I began an investigation of the types of community/university development partnerships that fell into Schramm and Nye's "Empowerment/Capacity-Building" category. My aim was to identify several principles of good practice that could provide guidance to policy makers and program developers. I began by surveying colleges and universities that were operating public service programs that focused on low-income communities. I drew my list from the members of Campus Compact, a coalition of 950 institutions of higher education committed to civic involvement. Approximately 135 campuses responded to my invitation to complete a short web based survey."

Elements of Success

While the challenges faced by the studied community/university development partnerships were often great, their case studies identify several elements that seem to contribute to the success of a community/university development partnership. The following are the most striking:

1. Partnerships that do not allow both parties to achieve their institutional self-interests do not survive. Both the community and the campus must be clear about their respective institutional self-interests, and comparable benefits for both the academic and the community partners must be gained.
2. Successful partnerships require significant executive leadership and often visible support from the university president, the mayor, the Chamber of Commerce director, respected members of the labor community, and elders from the community's major religious denominations.
3. Skilled staff who can understand both the nature of higher education politics and the fundamentals of community organizing are critical. "Organ-izational boundary-crossers," in particular, seem to play a pivotal role. These individuals occupy key leadership positions within their own organizations but also understand the history, culture, structure, and operation of their partnering organizations.
4. Successful partnerships develop slowly, and significant time is required to move from the initial relationship building stage to the program implementation stage, often five to ten years. The case studies confirmed the wisdom of Henry Mintzberg's "ready, fire, aim" approach to organizational change, which stresses the importance of small victories in building the momentum required to sustain systemic reform efforts.
5. Finally, the willingness of both community and campus leaders to reflect upon, learn from, and adjust to challenges and mistakes appears to be a central requirement of a successful partnership.

Appendix E: Civic Engagement Task Force Final Report - Excerpt

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT: RENEWING THE LAND GRANT MISSION

May 15, 2001, Submitted By Ed Fogelman, Chair

[Excerpt]

The land grant tradition, which has developed over a period of one hundred forty years since its inception with the Morrill Act of 1862 and enriched by subsequent acts of Congress, does not consist of a single continuing public mission but encompasses multiple public purposes that change over time in response to new social conditions and historic circumstances. Several enduring goals lie at the heart of this tradition.

- **Educational Opportunity:** One enduring goal has been to open higher education to excluded people disadvantaged by their class, gender, race, ethnicity or other circumstances. The first beneficiaries were working class white males, but over time land grant missions came to include providing opportunities for higher education to women, blacks and to Native Americans.
- **Social Responsibility:** A second goal has been responsiveness to the actual concerns of people in the community. Some of the most pressing on-going concerns have been economic and vocational, but they also include an interest in liberal education, quality K-12 schooling, training for leadership and effective citizenship, and the performance of governmental and other institutions.
- **Public Scholarship:** A third enduring goal has been the development, dissemination, and application of new knowledge for the practical benefit of people in the community. Basic research, learning, and applications of knowledge are intertwined activities, although the areas of inquiry and fields of application have changed dramatically.

Within the land grant tradition, institutional missions have been diverse and have changed with the times, but since the end of the Cold War there is no agreed sense of what the contemporary land grant mission should be. During almost a century and a half, land grant institutions have responded to urgent widely shared public purposes, from preserving the Union during the Civil War, promoting national economic development, providing educational opportunities for a growing and increasingly diverse population, fighting two World Wars, and coping with the Great Depression. But now land grant institutions have no clear common purpose to give public meaning to their work. The challenge is to articulate a public purpose that addresses contemporary concerns and so to renew the land grant tradition in a new millennium.

Appendix F: Humphrey Institute Graduate Student Capstone Project Report

In Summer 2006, a capstone course offered by the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs required mid-career students completing work for a Masters Degree in Public Affairs to work with a "client" on a project where the knowledge gained through their studies could be applied in a real-life situation. The Hennepin-University Partnership Liaison agreed to be one of the clients and worked with a group of four graduate students on a project to identify elements of successful collaboration and to suggest steps to institutionalize the Partnership. At the completion of this work, the HHH student group concluded:

... the consultants [student group] reviewed relevant literature; met with H-UP staff, and interviewed fifteen University faculty and administrators. Overall, the consultants concluded that H-UP must transition to the next phase of development. The collaboration is at the end of the initiation phase and needs to move into a growth phase, rooted in faculty involvement.

One of the major challenges facing H-UP is the lack of time faculty perceives as available. Without stronger faculty involvement, the collaboration will not be sustainable. One of the reasons why H-UP did not seem to be a high priority for faculty was the abstract nature of the collaboration. H-UP is structured around "connecting where it counts" (Doty & Neuse, 2005) over a broad range of potential areas. Most other successful collaborations are organized around a narrower focus, enabling those involved to show their passion about a particular cause or interest. It is much harder to be passionate about working with a county. Structuring H-UP around strategic interest areas may generate greater faculty involvement. An awareness campaign would also generate additional faculty interest and involvement.

Formal programs that build personal relationships between faculty and County employees are recommended. Interest groups, formal intern programs, and University degree programs tailored towards Hennepin County employees are suggestions. A durable structure must be developed that can last beyond particular individuals leaving employment at either organization.

Funding is vital for H-UP to become sustainable. Providing funding in the range of \$200,000 to \$500,000 for an Innovation Fund would send a strong message to University faculty and Hennepin County employees that collaboration is valued and encouraged. Contributions should be equal from both organizations. Such funding could support a joint list of priorities with oversight from a new H-UP Leadership Team. The Innovation Fund would also generate attention, draw University faculty in, and potentially increase the priority that faculty attach to the collaboration.

To be sustainable, collaboration must be rooted in mission and governance, with sufficient mutual interest. University faculty must be fully involved and build personal relationships with Hennepin County employees. Joint priorities need to be established, with funding to support those priorities. Sustainable collaboration requires a variety of approaches. A diversified strategy must be employed.

The research and analysis provided by this student group was of value to the H-UP, and contributed to the proposal for next steps for the H-UP.

Appendix G: Excerpts from "A New Era of Higher Education-Community Partnerships: The Role and Impact of Colleges and Universities in Greater Boston Today", A Report from The Carol R. Goldberg Seminar, Prepared by The Boston Foundation and the University College of Citizenship and Public Service at Tufts University

Excerpt 1

... the relationships between local colleges and universities and their host communities must be seriously reconsidered. It is time to recognize the stake that higher education has in the region and the stake the region has in higher education. Today, civic leaders are inviting higher education leaders to play a more active civic role in the life of the community...

Excerpt 2 (from a lessons learned section with regard to a partnership between Tufts University and Medford-Somerville communities)

- Key ingredients in developing true partnerships include mutual respect and clear understanding of each other's needs. Creative leadership on both sides is essential.
- Many of the transactions between a university and its host community(ies) are ad hoc, one-time, or year-to-year interactions. This episodic approach deprives both the university and local communities of the greater benefits that they can achieve through longer-term agreements.